IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SHANNON GOLAT,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

WISCONSIN STATE COURT SYSTEM, et al.,

23-cv-719-jdp

Defendants.

Plaintiff Shannon Golat alleges that she was fired from her job as a court reporter based on her gender and in retaliation for her complaints of alleged sexual harassment and a hostile work environment. Plaintiff has moved for summary judgment in her favor on all of her claims. Dkt. 89. Defendants have filed a motion to compel and for Rule 37 sanctions, among other relief, and to stay all case deadlines. Dkt. 105. The court ORDERS plaintiff to respond to defendants' motion by May 9, 2025, and defendants' reply shall be due by May 16, 2025.

As for defendants' stay request, the court defers its ruling until plaintiff has had an opportunity to answer defendants' serious allegations. In the meantime, the parties must keep to the summary judgment briefing schedule as set. Defendants must respond as best they can by May 9, 2025, and note in their briefing if they are hindered by discovery violations. Plaintiff's reply remains due May 19, 2025.

Relatedly, defendants did not file for summary judgment by the April 18, 2025 deadline. The court will decide whether to reset this deadline in resolving the motion to compel and for sanctions. Defendants should consider that, if the court finds they could have moved for summary judgment by the deadline despite the alleged discovery issues, the court will not reset the deadline. The court understands defendants to believe plaintiff withheld evidence

and may have even spoliated evidence, but that alone does not mean that defendants could

not have asked for summary judgment on plaintiff's claims. If plaintiff sprung withheld

evidence in response to a summary judgment motion, the appropriate course would be to move

to strike the late produced evidence then or ask for some other appropriate sanction after the

violation becomes clear. Defendants may seek leave to file a late summary judgment motion

(with all materials attached) by the close of briefing on the spoliation motion on May 16, 2025.

And because an earlier request is less likely to impact the overall schedule, the sooner

defendants make such a request, the more likely the court is to grant it.

SO ORDERED.

Entered April 25, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

ANITA MARIE BOOR

Magistrate Judge

2